

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 03 2007

RemarksClaim objection

Claim 22 has been objected to for insufficient antecedent basis. Claim 22 has been cancelled, rendering the objection moot.

35 USC 101

Claims 18-21 have been rejected under 35 USC 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter because claim 18 is broad enough to include propagated signals. Claim 18 has been amended to limit the claimed subject matter to a tangible medium, thus eliminating coverage for propagated signals. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

All original claims have been rejected based on the following cited references. Independent claims 1, 9, 13, and 18 will be shown to be allowable over the cited references, based on the following analysis, and their dependent claims will therefore be allowable based on their dependency from the independent claims. Claims 22-35 have been cancelled, and the rejections to those claims are therefore moot.

35 USC 102

Claims 22, 24-27, and 29-35 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent publication no. 2003/0014643 ("Asami"). These claims have been cancelled, rendering the rejection moot.

35 USC 103

Claims 1-3, 6-10, 18, and 19 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asami in view of U.S. patent no. 6,684,343 ("Bouchier").

Claims 23 and 28 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asami in view of U.S. patent publication no. 2003/0177373 ("Moyer").

Claims 5, 12-17, 20 and 21 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asami and Bouchier in view of U.S. patent no. 6,000,033 ("Kelley").

Claims 4 and 11 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asami and Bouchier in view of U.S. patent no. 6,532,553 ("Gwilt").

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections because the cited references do not disclose or suggest every element of any pending claim, as the following analysis shows. All the claims pertain to using a first password to access a first set of resources for debug purposes, and using a second password to access a second set of resources for debug purposes.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, circuitry that prevents access using the first password if access using the second password is enabled, and circuitry that prevents access using

the second password if access using the first password is enabled. In other words, only one of these passwords may be enabled for potential use at any given time. These limitations were previously in claim 5 (which has now been cancelled as it would be redundant), and the office action cited Kelley (col. 7 lines 40-44) for these limitations. However, this portion of Kelley only recites that the services that are accessible with different passwords may be mutually exclusive (i.e., all the services accessible with one password are not accessible when using another password). Claim 1 recites that the passwords themselves are mutually exclusive (if the first password can be used, the second password cannot, and if the second password can be used, the first password cannot). The combination of Asami, Bouchier, and Kelley does not disclose or suggest these limitations.

Claim 13 also recites that the passwords themselves are mutually exclusive, and as with claim 1, Kelley was cited in the office action as teaching these limitations. As with claim 1, Kelley does not disclose or suggest these limitations.

Claim 9 recites that entering the second password disables the first password. This is narrower than claim 1 or 13, as it recites a particular mechanism for making the passwords mutually exclusive. Claim 9 was rejected based only on Asami and Bouchier, but the office action never points to any specific portion Bouchier that disables one of the passwords based on entering another password, and Asami doesn't use passwords.

Claim 18 recites that disabling the first password prevents accessing the first set of code during the second debug stage. This is also narrower than claim 1 or 13. Like claim 9, claim 18 was rejected based only on Asami and Bouchier, but the office action

never points to any specific portion Bouchier that disables a password, and Asami doesn't use passwords.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAY 03 2007

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and indication of allowance by the Examiner is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, he or she is requested to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number shown below as soon as possible. If any fee insufficiency or overpayment is found, please charge any insufficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0221.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Date: May 1, 2007

/John F. Travis/

John F. Travis
Reg. No. 43,203

Attorney Telephone:

(512) 732-3918

Correspondence Address:

Intel Corporation
c/o Intellevate, LLC
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402